UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,567	10/25/2003	Nick E. Ciavarella	GOJ 03031	2169
	7590 08/14/2007 NNER, GREIVE, BOBAK	EXAMINER		
FIRST NATIO	FIRST NATIONAL TOWER FOURTH FLOOR 106 S. MAIN STREET AKRON, OH 44308		DERAKSHANI, PHILIPPE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3754	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

7	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/693,567	CIAVARELLA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI	3754			
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet with t	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply with Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA OF CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply cation. Ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS by statute, cause the application to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 18 April 2007.				
· ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for	, <del>_</del>				
closed in accordance with the practice	under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-7 and 9</u> is/are pending in the	e application				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	• •				
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5-7</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-4, 9</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	·	·			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.	•			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	e correction is required if the drawing(s) i	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		19(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority do					
	cuments have been received in Appl				
application from the Internationa	the priority documents have been red	ceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action f		seived			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mary (PTO-413)			
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li></ul>		ail Date mal Patent Application			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's arguments, see appeal brief, filed 4/18/07, with respect to claims 2-7 and 9 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 5-7 has been withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tucker et al 4,974,753.

Tucker et al show a collar comprising a keyplate 64 and a first 30 and second 40 flange. Tucker et al discloses the claimed invention except for the notch 68 on the flange 30 and the projecting part 32 on the dispenser. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to put the notch on the flange and the projecting part on the dispenser, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Re claim 9 discloses the claimed invention except for each flange including a notch. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a notch on the second flange, since it has been held that

mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tucker 4,974,753 in view of Smernoff 5,377,876.

Tucker et al lack the collar having a vertical rib. Smernoff shows a vertical rib 16 on a collar to facilitate grasping (column 4, lines 33-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Tucker et al collar with a vertical rib as taught by Smernoff to facilitate grasping.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7 are allowed.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/18/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that the flanges of Tucker et al do not receive a keyplate therebetween. Tucker et al show first 30 and second flanges 40 receiving a keyplate 64 in as much as applicant claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI whose telephone number is 571-272-4925. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/693,567

Art Unit: 3754

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PHILIPPE S DERAKSHANI Primary Examiner Art Unit 3754

PD 8/7/07